REMARKS

In view of the following remarks and the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-26, 28 and 30-39 are pending at the time of this action, with Claims 1, 10 and 19 being independent. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-26, 28 and 30-39 are rejected.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-26, 28, 30-39 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gilbrech (U.S. Patent 6,173, 399) and Schutte et al (U.S. Patent 6,178,455). Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. These contentions are respectfully traversed.

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph – Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-39

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-39 are enabled because the specification clearly describes the subject matter of the claims in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention without undue experimentation. For example, the Claim 1 feature of "the agent component is configured for a dynamically-assigned address" is described in the specification on page 6, lines 7-12; page 8, lines 4-13 (first full paragraph); page 10, lines 7-24 (first full paragraph). In one embodiment, the specification discloses on page 6, lines 7-12 that the "ISP may assign a dynamic IP address" to the home gateway. In another embodiment, the specification discloses on page 8, lines 4-13 that one possible implementation of the "agent component" is as a "home gateway." Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the claimed features and know how to use the claimed techniques with the subject matter disclosed within the specification. Therefore, Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-39 are patentable and meet the enablement requirement at least because the specification enables one skilled in the art to make or use the invention without undue experimentation.

35 U.S.C. 103 – Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-26, 28, 30-39

Claim 1

Claim 1 is patentable at least because the suggested combination of Gilbrech and Schutte fails to disclose each and every feature of the claim. The Examiner agrees that Gilbrech does not disclose that (1) the agent component is configured with a dynamically assigned IP address, and (2) the maintaining a persistent connection between the agent and the server (bottom of page 4 of the office action). Therefore, Gilbrech fails to disclose each and every feature of the claim as recited in Claim 1.

The office action alleges that Schutte, when combined with Gilbrech, remedies the deficiencies Gilbrech's teachings to render Claim 1 obvious (disclosure: page 2: lines 5-10). However, Schutte does not remedy the deficiencies of Gilbrech to render Claim 1 obvious.

For instance, Schutte does not disclose the recited Claim 1 feature of "**establishing a persistent connection from an agent component to a server**" (emphasis added). For example, as explained in the specification, "The agent component 14 connects to the server component 12 and maintains **a long standing (persistent) connection** with the server component 12 that can be used for subsequent data exchange," and "a long standing connection exists between the components 12, 14 for as long as software for supporting their connection remains running on both components 12, 14" (specification: page 6, lines 1-6). Schutte fails to disclose this feature of Claim 1.

Instead, Schutte discloses a router that dynamically requests a set of network addresses and assigns those addresses to hosts that are connected to the router (Schutte: Abstract). Schutte teaches that "when a cable router or RF modem becomes active, it sends a message requesting a set of IP addresses from the head end, which dynamically assigns the set of IP addresses and sends a message comprising the set of IP addresses to the cable router or RF modem" (Schutte: Abstract). Schutte's CATV head end 122, which can correspond to the server component 12 in the specification, connects to Schutte's active RF modem 106, which can correspond to the agent component 14 in the specification (Schutte: Fig. 1). Schutte teaches that "RF modem 106(j) serves as the router for that set of addresses," and sends the dynamic IP addresses to the respective hosts (Schutte: Abstract: Col. 11, lines 58-59). So in this aspect, the RF modem of Schutte is like the agent component 14 of the specification in serving as a router for multiple

hosts (e.g., see Specification: Fig. 1). However, unlike the Agent Component 14 in the specification with the persistent connection with the Server Component 12, Schutte teaches that **the RF modem 106 is only active as long as an active host 108 is connected to it** (Schutte: Col. 11, lines 50-54; 59-64; Fig. 2). Hence, the RF modem and the connection of the RF modem is dependent upon whether the modem's host is active or inactive. Schutte teaches that when the RF modem is not active, then the connection (i.e., the "<channel, pipe, link ID> triple") and IP addresses are assigned to other RF modems that are active (Schutte: Col. 16, lines 2-5). Therefore, Schutte does not teach or suggest "a **persistent connection** from an agent component to a server" as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Schutte and Gilbrech fail to teach the Claim 1 feature of " receiving a request from the device across the public network at the server **to establish a connection between the device and the private network**." Schutte teaches dynamic allocation of addresses to hosts (Schutte: Abstract). However, Schutte does not teach "a method to enable a device at a public network to establish **a connection into a private network**" as recited in Claim 1. As supported within the specification, "the client/agent's connection to the private network 20 enables the client 16 to securely access and use devices 22a-N included in the private network 20" (Specification: page 4, lines 8-11). Without having **a persistent connection to the agent component** 14 in the private network 20, the devices on the Internet will have difficulty locating and accessing **the private network** (Specification: Fig. 1). Therefore, the suggested combination of Schutte and Gilbrech fails to meet the burden to establish obviousness.

Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable at least because the suggested combination of the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the features of the claim.

Claims 10 and 19

The amended independent Claims 10 and 19 include features that are similar to Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 10 and 19 are patentable for at least the same reasons above with respect to Claim 1. Allowance of Claims 10 and 19 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-12, 14-18, 20-26, 28, 30-39

Claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-12, 14-18, 20-26, 28, 30-39 are all patentable at least for depending on an allowable base claim (base Claim 1 for Claims 2-3, 5-9, 30-32; base Claim 10 for Claims 11-12, 14-18, 33-35; base Claim 19 for Claims 20-26, 28, 36-39). These dependent claims are also patentable for reciting patentable subject matter in their own right.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the Applicants believe that Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-26, 28 and 30-39 are in condition for allowance and ask that these pending claims be allowed. The foregoing comments made with respect to the positions taken by the Examiner are not to be construed as acquiescence with other positions of the Examiner that have not been explicitly contested. Accordingly, the arguments for patentability of a claim should not be construed as implying that there are not other valid reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims.

Please apply the fee for the Petition For Extension of Time to our deposit account 06-1050 and any other charges.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2006

Dwight U. Thompson
Reg. No. 53,688

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

DUT/jhg
10607380.doc